



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

that "there is no longer any New World, or Old World, but only one world, the whole world."

The resolutions voted by the Conference we give in full on another page. They were in line with what has been done at previous meetings of the Union, though in certain respects they went further and were more urgent. The powers signatory of the Hague Conventions were urged to take steps to put an end to the horrible conflict now raging in the Far East, and the Interparliamentary Bureau at Berne was instructed to convey this resolution to the knowledge of the said governments. A resolution was adopted expressing deep satisfaction at what has been done the past year in the conclusion of special treaties of obligatory arbitration, at the general agreement between France and Great Britain for the disposal of all their colonial differences, and urging similar action upon other governments having differences pending. A revision of the laws of war was urged in the interests of the better protection of the commercial and navigation rights of neutrals.

The most important action of the Conference was its resolution unanimously and enthusiastically adopted, inviting the governments of the world to hold an international conference to dispose of the questions left over by the Hague Conference — arrest and reduction of armaments, etc. — to consider the matter of the general negotiation of treaties of obligatory arbitration, and to examine the question of the feasibility of creating *an international congress to meet periodically for the discussion of international questions*. The President of the United States was "respectfully and urgently requested to invite all the nations to be represented in such a conference."

Except that it consumed considerable time in debating the question of widening and strengthening the Interparliamentary Union, so as to increase its efficiency and bring into it parliaments like those of Japan and the South American republics, not now represented in its membership, the Conference wasted no time in academic discussions, but threw the whole weight of its influence into these few resolutions regarding matters of immediate and serious moment — the stopping of the Russo-Japanese war, reduction of armaments, extension of the scope of obligatory arbitration, protection of the rights of neutrals on the high seas, and the creation of a stated international congress for deliberation upon international questions.

Considering the circumstances of its meeting under the immediate auspices of the United States government, the influence of the Conference is certain to be large and almost immediate. We shall be greatly surprised if our government does not the coming winter, in response to the resolution above mentioned and others of like nature already before it, send out invitations to all the nations of the world to send representatives to a new conference to complete the

work left undone at The Hague, and to take under advisement the important question now commanding the attention of all publicists and students of international relations — the creation of an international congress as the counterpart and complement of the Hague Court.

A New International Peace Conference.

The members of the Interparliamentary Conference held at St. Louis last month, after visiting Denver, Chicago and Niagara Falls, completed their trip as the guests of the government on the 24th ult. by a visit to Washington and the presentation to President Roosevelt of the important resolution adopted at their meeting on the 13th ult. at St. Louis. The resolution is given on another page of this paper.

The presentation of the resolution to the President was made by Dr. Gobat, the Secretary of the Interparliamentary Union, in a brief but exceptionally fine speech. The President responded briefly and in a manner which pleased the visitors very much. The substance of his response was that he was in entire sympathy with the aims of the Interparliamentary Union, and that he would, as early as it could practicably be done, invite the governments of all the nations of the world to send delegates to an international conference to consider the subjects which had been suggested in the St. Louis resolution.

The importance of this determination of the President cannot be overestimated. The proposed conference will not be a new meeting of the Hague Conference, as has been imagined by some. That Conference ended its existence when its great work was done. The new Conference will of course be like the one of 1899 in many respects, but it will differ from it in being composed of representatives of all the nations of the world, as the one at The Hague was not. The work outlined for it will also be of much farther-reaching significance. It will be asked to consider at least three commanding subjects, — the arrest and reduction of the great armaments of the world, left over by the Hague Conference, the extension of the work and power of the Hague Court through a comprehensive system of treaties of obligatory arbitration, and the advisability of the *creation of a regular periodic congress of the nations*, — the beginnings, that is, of a political organization of the world.

This latter subject is now impressing itself powerfully upon all thoughtful students of international affairs. Our readers have already been made thoroughly acquainted with the idea. The resolution of the Massachusetts Legislature, adopted unanimously on the petition of the American Peace Society, asking Congress to authorize the President to invite the governments of the world to unite in creating an

advisory congress of the nations, is now before the Foreign Affairs Committees of both Houses of Congress. There is good prospect that the coming winter the resolution will be reported favorably and that Congress will give its approval to the proposition. When that is once done, the President will be able to move in the matter with the absolute assurance of accomplishing what the Interparliamentary Union found him ready to do.

The adoption of the St. Louis resolution by the Interparliamentary Conference—the first time the subject had ever been before it—and the pledge of the President in regard to carrying it to execution may well be regarded one of the greatest events of the year in the field of world interests. It is encouraging in the highest degree. A Congress of the Nations, for the discussion and disposition of world questions, is now looming large on the horizon. It is as certain to be realized as that the permanent International Tribunal already exists. The time is already ripe for it.

The completion of the system of arbitration, which the proposed Conference will undertake, the arrest and reduction of armaments, which it will be asked to provide for, will be accomplishments of the greatest moment; but the laying of the bases of a world-organization, through which the nations, without sacrificing their local autonomy, will be able properly to dispose of their extensive common interests, to cultivate wider mutual acquaintance, to extend the foundations of justice among themselves, to remove misunderstandings, to establish a reign of well-recognized law, like that now prevailing among individuals within the nations, and thus to *assure* general peace over all the earth, will make the new conference which the President proposes to call an event the greatness of whose glory no imagination can picture in advance.

The dark, savage struggle in the Far East may thwart the wishes of the Interparliamentary Union and the President's purpose during the coming winter, but that struggle will end, and we shall see great light after the darkness.

The Argument from the Horrors of War.

Otherwise good people are often met with who seem to be entirely unmoved by what we call, for lack of a stronger and more appropriate term, the horrors of war. The old delusion that war is sometimes a moral necessity and a moral tonic seems to have rendered them incapable of feeling, or even of looking straight into, the cruel and loathsome realities of battlefields and sieges. They feel, therefore, that these horrors must just be taken down without thought and without inspection, as if they had no moral characteristics in themselves.

There is a feeling pretty widely spread, even among opponents of war, that it is a cheap and sentimental

proceeding to call up the horrors of fighting as a means of arousing opposition to it. We confess that we have never been able to fathom the causes lying back of this mental attitude. Is it pure hard-heartedness? Is it unwillingness to suffer the soul-agonies induced by gazing at these horrors? Is it a manifestation of that weariness and disgust which comes from hearing repeated the same old story? Is it the blasting influence on the soul of false ideals of manhood and courage, of patriotism and self-sacrifice? Or is it merely the result of the hardening effect which war, in which men from time out of mind have engaged, has had upon the individual and the public conscience?

One would think that naturally healthy minds, in which Christian nurture has developed tenderness of disposition and kindness of character, would never cease to cry out against war on the ground of its loathsome beastialities and unutterable cruelties. Every new war brings its fresh crop of horrors. Why should not every war, therefore, bring its fresh outburst of disgust and moral indignation? We are well aware that among the early advocates of peace this was the stock argument. The changes were incessantly rung on the horrors and woes of the battlefield. Why should they not have been? These are the very substance, the flesh and bones of war. No words can ever exhaust their terrible meaning. These early peace men were wise. They put their finger on the very centre of the plague spot. They went to the inner chamber of the "hell of war" and revealed it in all its hideousness.

What language could portray a tithe of the fiendish passions, the diabolic deeds of the Napoleonic campaigns, under which the whole of Europe lay bleeding at every vein for nearly a quarter of a century? What word-artist could ever portray the loathsomeness of the conditions about Metz in 1870—the starving, tongue-parched, insanely-laughing men shut up by the wall of merciless German soldiers, until their faces, foul with dirt, bore little resemblance to the human? Why should one be silent, for fear of being reckoned sentimental, about the horrors of the women's and children's prison pens in South Africa, the nameless wanton cruelties of some of the European troops on their march to Peking, the desolations wrought by portions of the American forces in the Philippines? Has humanity lost its heart that these things should be coolly pushed away out of sight?

No, this argument from war's horrors ought never to go out of fashion, will never go out of fashion so long as men are men—beings with moral perception and moral feeling. And this argument is working more powerfully to-day than ever before. For, though men in general say less about the horrors of war, they feel them much more deeply than they have ever been felt in the past; down deep in the souls of our civilized men and women, who are becoming increasingly kind and benevolent, there is a growing